

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yaegashi et al. (US 6,376,861). In the rejected claims, Claim 1 is independent.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the basis that the teaching of Yaegashi et al. fails to teach every element of the claimed invention. Yaegashi et al. is insufficient to render the claimed invention unpatentable.

Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner on the basis that the teaching of Yaegashi et al. only discloses a thin-film transistor having a gate electrode, a source electrode and a drain electrode each having a first conductive film, a second conductive film and a third conductive film which fails to include a first, a second and a third conductive layers made of alloy layers each having a same main metal component. The first conductive films of the gate electrode, the source electrode and the drain electrode of Yaegashi et al. are formed of a metal as a main

component selected out of Al, Cu, and Ag respectively. The second conductive films of the gate electrode, the source electrode and the drain electrode of Yaegashi et al. are formed of Mo containing nitrogen or an alloy of Mo containing nitrogen. The third conductive films of the gate electrode, the source electrode and the drain electrode of Yaegashi et al. are formed of Mo or an alloy of Mo as a main component. All the three conductive films of the gate electrode, the source electrode and the drain electrode of Yaegashi et al. do not have a same main metal component. Moreover, the three conductive films of the gate electrode should not be treated as the first, second and third conductive layers of the claimed invention since they are formed under the semiconductor layers and they can not be the source and drain electrodes. And it is quite clear that the three conductive films of the source electrode and the drain electrode of Yaegashi et al. can not be treated as the first, second and third conductive layers of the claimed invention since they do not have a same main metal component. Moreover, the thin-film transistor of Yaegashi et al. fails to show an opening through the second semiconductive film, the first conductive film, the second conductive film and the third conductive film and exposing the first semiconductive film. Therefore, the teaching of Yaegashi et al. fails to teach every element of the claimed invention. According to MPEP §2131, To Anticipate A Claim, The Reference Must Teach Every Element Of The Claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Yaegashi et al. actually fail to render the claimed invention unpatentable.

Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi et al. in view of Hayama et al. (US 5,416,341) .

Applicant respectfully disagree with Examiner since the teaching of Hayama also fails to disclose the element of the claimed invention which Yaegashi et al. dose not teach, the combination of Yaegashi et al. and Hayama is also insufficient to render the claimed invention unpatentable. According to MPEP 2143 Basic Requirements of a Prima Facie Case of Obviousness, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Yaegashi et al. and Hayama do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks to the claims, Applicant contends that claimed invention is patentable thereover. Besides Claims 9-15, Claims 1-8 are also in condition for favorable consideration and allowance of Claims 1-8 are most respectfully requested.

This Amendment was prepared by Applicant, and is being submitted without substantive change by the undersigned Attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



David I. Klein
Registration No. 33,253

Dated: 16 Aug. 2003

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410)465-6678

Customer No.
04586